

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Action of 08/24/2005. This request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner because blocks in the drawings should be labeled with legends along with reference numerals. Applicant herein submits drawings in compliance with the Examiner's recommendation.

Further, Applicant provides an additional drawing in the form of a flow chart that should supplement and clarify the previously submitted drawings. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112Claims 10 through 26

Claims 10 through 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. More specifically, the Examiner states that the specification fails to disclose that the sensor can sense the metal or magnetic material by the material touching against the CCD image device. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

First, neither the specification nor the claims states that the sensor can sense the metal or magnetic material by the material touching against the CCD image device. The image device is to record an image and therefore nothing ever touches the CCD. The Applicant states in the specification "The sensor 1 can contain both a thermal sensor 15 and a CCD image device 14. The temperature information obtained by the thermal sensor and the image information obtained by the CCD image device is sent to the micro-processor 2 where a comparison between the result and the database is made to see if any metal or magnetic material exists. When detecting any metal or magnetic material, the micro-processor 2 sends out a signal to the control panel where the warning device 32 warns the user with sounds or signals. The warning device 32 might be a diode 321 or a beeper 322." There is

no mention of the CCD image device touching the metal or magnetic material. Applicant is therefore confused as to what the Examiner feels the specification should disclose.

Next, the Examiner states that the specification fails to disclose "how the microprocessor is capable to determine that the material is a metal or magnetic material by comparing the image information and the database." The specification states that the CCD sensor is able to detect metal or magnetic material and this sensor then sends the detected result to the micro-processor. Here, the information is stored with information in the database. It is obvious to one skilled in the art that the database must contain information that is comparable to the detected metal or magnetic material. Further, it is obvious from the specification description that if the CCD is detecting various types of metals and then compares them with something in the database that the data in the database must be various types of metals. With respect to how the microprocessor determines if it is metal or magnetic material, it is obvious that if the image submitted by the CCD sensor is comparable to the stored data then the microprocessor will send out a warning.

Finally, the Examiner states that the specification fails to disclose how a capacitance sensor senses the sharpness of the metal or magnetic material. Actually, the specification does not state that the capacitance sensor senses the "sharpness" of the metal or magnetic material. What it says is that there is "a capacitance sensor that shows capacitance values depending on the sharpness or distance of the metal or magnetic material when any metal or magnetic material exists, so as to detect the location of the metal or magnetic material." Therefore, the sensor will show a capacitance value based on the sharpness of the metal, or based on the distance to the metal or magnetic material. The sensor does not actually sense the degree of sharpness.

Claims 2-7 and Claims 10 through 26

Claims 2-7 "said warning system" lacks antecedent basis. Applicant has amended the claim to read "warning ~~system~~ device" thereby removing the offending matter and now the term "warning device" has antecedent basis in Claim 1.

Claims 10-17 the Examiner states that it is not clear how the metal or magnetic material can be sensed by it touching against the CCD image device. As argued above, Applicant has reviewed Claims 10-17 and does not find any reference to the CCD touching against the metal or magnetic material. Claim 11 states "The improved alert system of Claim 10, wherein said sensor is a CCD image device that delivers captured image information to said micro-processor where a comparison between said image information and said database is made; said micro-processor detecting any metal or magnetic material then sends out a signal to said control panel, prompting said warning device to warn users with sounds or signals." It is clear here that the CCD device simply captures an image and conveys the image to the micro-processor. Thereafter the micro-processor compares the image to images in the database to establish if there is metal or a magnetic material. Then, if the micro-processor establishes that metal or magnetic material is present, it sends out a signal to the control panel which in turn sends a warning to the user. There is no reference anywhere in the specification or claims that states that the metal or magnetic material is sensed by touching against the CCD image device.

Claim 15

Examiner states that "said control panel electronic gas injects" lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction has been made to the claim. No new matter has been added.

Claim 18

The Examiner states that it is not clear how the detector can detect through the electromagnetic wave-proof which is used for isolating the sensor's detection.

In fact, the detector cannot detect through the electromagnetic wave-proof and that is the point. The wave-proof device is used to store the combined metal or magnetic material and is to prevent the detector from detecting in order to prevent error. Claim 18 has been amended to clarify.

Claim 26

The Examiner states that it is not clear how the capacitance sensor can sense

the "sharpness" of the metal or magnetic material. As explained above, the capacitance sensor doesn't actually sense the sharpness. What it says is that there is "a capacitance sensor that shows capacitance values depending on the sharpness or distance of the metal or magnetic material when any metal or magnetic material exists, so as to detect the location of the metal or magnetic material." What the Applicant means is that the sensor will show a capacitance value based on the sharpness of the metal, or based on the distance to the metal or magnetic material. Therefore, the sensor does not actually sense the degree of sharpness.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 1 through 26 recites statutory subject matter that is novel and new, is subject matter of the present invention and is fully supported in the disclosure of the present invention, and therefore respectfully requests that claims 1 through 26 be found allowable and that this application be passed to issue. No new matter has been included.

If for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper has not been timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 50-2069, **referencing docket number 003-03-017.**

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Tracy M. Heims
Reg. No. 53,010

Apex Juris, pllc
13194 Edgewater Lane Northeast
Seattle, Washington, 98125
Email: tracy@apexjuris.com
Phone (206) 664-0314
Fax (206) 664-0329